

From: Anil (Neil) Gulati
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 11/20/01 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This judgement has not been anywhere near severe enough. Microsoft have been using FUD tactics throughout the whole process. As the following extract demonstrates, despite all their wailing about 'innovation' (not something Microsoft is known for) and 'freedom', they have been prepared to increase market share by any means whatsoever, morals and laws notwithstanding.

Microsoft needs to be punished and fined as a clear message to other companies that criminal activity is not allowable as part of business in the free world. Also Microsoft needs to have its operations curtailed so that it will be restricted from repeating the same behaviour. There is no indication that they will do this voluntarily. The split up of the company seems to be the most viable outcome as initially ruled by Judge Jackson.

12. Microsoft, however, has not been willing simply to compete on the merits. For

example, as Microsoft's Christian Wildfeuer wrote in February 1997, Microsoft concluded that it

would "be very hard to increase browser share on the merits of IE 4 alone. It will be more

important to leverage the OS asset to make people use IE instead of Navigator." (MS7 004346).

Thus, Microsoft began, and continues today, a pattern of anticompetitive practices designed to

thwart browser competition on the merits, to deprive customers of a choice between alternative

browsers, and to exclude Microsoft's Internet browser competitors.

Anil Gulati

--

Anil (Neil) Gulati
anil.gulati@bigpond.com
anilg@users.sourceforge.net
(0414) 85 87 82
Leichhardt, Sydney

--